

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/517,413	05/16/2005	Kenneth Sundberg	PR/3-23156/A/RAI 56/PCT	4017		
:	7590 01/12/2007 LTY CHEMICALS CORI	EXAM	EXAMINER			
PATENT DEPARTMENT 540 WHITE PLAINS RD P O BOX 2005 TARRYTOWN, NY 10591-9005			CORDRAY,	CORDRAY, DENNIS R		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1731			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			01/12/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/517,413	SUNDBERG ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Dennis Cordray	1731			

	Dennis Cordray	1/31					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12/7/2006,12/11/2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ring replies: (1) an amendment, affi ice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	ion.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ITWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	6.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0001100				
<ol> <li>Ine proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to</li> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>	•		ecause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	12 50.017,					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ol>							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the second of the release of the second o		ll be entered and an	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	hadaaa aa ah a data ad Siisaa a N	ation of Annual will m					
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	•	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.  Other:							

Continuation of 11. Applicant agrues that the Fakoukakis reference makes absolutely no mention of ASA with low polymeric residues being used in paper. Applicant also argues that Tansley et al is primarily interested in alkyl ketene dimers and the examples therein only use ketene dimers. Applicant further argues that alkenyl succinic anhydride is only mentioned as conventional.

Fakoukakis recites alkenyl succinic anhydrides as industrially useful in many areas, but fails to mention papermaking. However, it is very well known in the art to use alkenyl succinic anhydrides as cellulose reactive sizing agents. Tansley et al recites in col 4, lines 22-26 that "Any conventional cellulose-reactive paper sizing agent, including, for example, alkenyl succinic anhydride, as well as ketene dimers may be usefully employed in this invention." Although ketene dimers are the preferred sizing agents, also noted as conventional, Tansley et al specifically recites alkenyl succinic anhydrides as usable also.

Motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the alkenyl succinic anhydrides of Fakoukakis et al in the paper of Tansley et al has been given in the most recent Office Action.

Applicant argues that Fakoukakis et al and Tansley et al could not have been aware of the specific advantages to sized paper by using the product of Fakoukakis in the papermaking process of Tansley. The appplicants enumerate the unobvious advantages on p 13 under Summary and Conclusions," the lower rate of hydrolysis and better color of the alkenyl succinic anhydride product according to the instant invention. However, the arguments are directed to unclaimed features of the invention. The limitations of the Specification are not read into the claims.

The rejection is maintained..

ERIC HUG
PRIMARY EXAMINE